

Remarks/Arguments:

Claims 1-5, 7-15, 17-23 and 25-27 are pending in the above-identified application. Claims 6, 16 and 24 have been cancelled.

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being obvious in view of Umezawa, Skaaning and Ishizuka. Claim 1 has been amended to clarify features which are neither disclosed or suggested by the prior art, namely,

... in a case where the cause determination part determines that the cause of image degradation **corresponding to the image** and the cause of image degradation corresponding to the answer do not match with each other, the image evaluation part changes the predetermined threshold value used to evaluate the image **quality with respect to the cause of image degradation corresponding to the answer** so that the cause of image degradation **corresponding to the image** and the cause of image degradation corresponding to the answer can match with each other. (Emphasis added).

The Office Action readily admits that Umezawa and Skaaning do not disclose these features. (Page 5, lines 7-13). The Office Action, however, states that the Abstract of Ishizuka teaches "... wherein changes are made to the predetermined threshold value used to evaluate the image so that the results can match with each other ('An update value about the reject value 2 is calculated based on the result information of a decision result input part 4 to input the decision result information of whether the information of this standard pattern is correct.', Ishizuka, abstract)" (Page 5, lines 14-18)

Applicant notes that the office is merely relying on the abstract of Ishizuka to make up for the deficiency of Umezawa and Skaaning. "Examiner's findings that claims in patent application are anticipated by prior art is vacated on appeal from rejection in which Examiner relied upon abstracts of two published Japanese patent applications without referring to translations of underlying applications." *In re Gavin*, 62 USPQ2d 1680 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 2001). Applicant, therefore, submits that this rejection is improper because it is based solely on the Abstract of the foreign patent to Ishizuka without referring to a translation of the underlying application.

Further, Applicant submits that the underlying application to Ishizuka does not disclose the features of claim 1.

According to Ishizuka:

The unknown input pattern and the respective standard patterns are processed for matching. Among the standard patterns of which matching distances calculated are below the rejection value, the standard pattern with the shortest matching distance is recognized as identical as the unknown input pattern, and the information of the standard pattern recognized is outputted.

The user decides whether the recognized result is right or wrong, based this outputted information. The user inputs the number of the wrong standard pattern from the deciding result input part 4 only when the result is wrong.

Deciding result control part 5 reads the rejection value from the rejection value memory 2 with respect to the input number. Control part 5 calculates the updated rejection value by subtracting the predetermined value "4" from the rejection value, and writes the updated rejection value to the rejection value memory 2.

See Ishizuka, page 3, lines 1-17

That is, the updated rejection value in Ishizuka is not a "... threshold value used to evaluate the image quality with respect to the cause of image degradation corresponding to the answer ..." as recited in claim 1.

For example, according to Applicant's exemplary embodiment, if the determined cause of image degradation corresponding to the image is "external light", the question "do you wear eye glasses?" may be asked and the answer "yes" may be inputted from the user. That is, Applicant's exemplary embodiment determines the cause of image degradation corresponding to the answer, namely, "wearing glasses" as the right (true) cause of the image degradation.

Further, Applicant's exemplary embodiment changes the threshold value used to evaluate the image quality with respect to the cause of image degradation (i.e. wearing glasses) corresponding to the answer, so that the cause of image degradation corresponding to the answer and the cause of image degradation corresponding to the image may match each other. Accordingly, the next time the image is taken, the cause of image degradation corresponding to the image should then be determined as "wearing glasses." The right (correct) cause of image degradation, therefore, may be decided and an appropriate message such as "please take off your glasses" can be outputted to the user, resulting in the

improvement of the ratio of recognition (matching). Applicants' claimed features are advantageous over the prior art because the preciseness of matching is increased.

By contrast, in Ishizuka, even if the user wearing the glasses is the true cause of image degradation, the rejecting values of the standard patterns which are not recognized are merely lowered, making it impossible to be recognized correctly without repetition.

Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is allowable over the art of record. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claim 1 is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-5, 7-15, 17-23 and 25-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being obvious in view of a combination of references to Umezawa, Skaaning, Ishizuka, Kondo Matsushita and Uchida. Claims 2-5, 7-15, 17-23 and 25-27 ultimately depend from claim 1. Accordingly, claims 2-5, 7-15, 17-23 and 25-27 are also allowable over the art of record.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that this Application is in condition for allowance which action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Jacques L. Etkowicz, Reg. No. 41,738
Attorney for Applicant

JLE/dmw

Dated: November 19, 2008

P.O. Box 980
Valley Forge, PA 19482
(610) 407-0700

NM349523